

1 GARY E. SCHNITZER, ESQ.
2 Nevada Bar No. 395
3 ADAM J. WAX, ESQ.
4 Nevada Bar No. 12126
5 KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER, & JOHNSON, CHTD.
6 8985 So. Eastern Avenue, Suite 200
7 Las Vegas, Nevada 89123
8 Telephone: (702) 352-6666
9 Facsimile: (702) 362-2203
10 Email: gschnitzer@ksjattorneys.com
11 awax@ksjattorneys.com
12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff,
Trade Show Services, LTD.
d/b/a Pro-Tect Security*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

14 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

15 TRADE SHOW SERVICES, LTD., a Nevada
16 Corporation, d/b/a PRO-TECT SECURITY
17 SERVICES,

18 Case No.: 2:17-cv-01685-JAD-NJK

19 Plaintiff,

20 vs.

21 INTEGRATED SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT
22 SERVICES, INC., an Arizona Corporation;
23 INTEGRATED SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT
24 SERVICES, INC., d/b/a SPECIAL
25 INTELLIGENCE SERVICE, an Arizona
26 Corporation; DOE INDIVIDUALS I through X,
27 inclusive; and ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES I
through X, inclusive,

28 Defendants.

29 **STIPULATION AND ORDER TO FILE PLAINTIFF'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF**
MOTION TO DISQUALIFY DEFENDANTS' ATTORNEYS ON JANUARY 30,
2018 (SECOND REQUEST)

30 Plaintiff, TRADE SHOW SERVICES, LTD., d/b/a PRO-TECT SECURITY SERVICES
31 ("Pro-Tect"), by and through its counsel of record, Gary E. Schnitzer, Esq., and Adam Wax,
32 Esq., of the law firm Kravitz, Schnitzer & Johnson, Chtd., and Defendant, Integrated Systems
33 Improvement Services, Inc., d/b/a Special Intelligence Services ("Defendant"), by and through
34 its counsel of record, Michael D. Rawlins, Esq., of the law firm Durham Jones & Pinegar, hereby
35

1 stipulate and agree that Plaintiff will file its Reply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's
2 Motion to Disqualify Defendants' Attorneys on or before January 30, 2018. Defendant's
3 Opposition was filed on December 26, 2017, making Pro-Tect's Reply due on or before January
4 2, 2018. **ECF No. 32.** The Parties previously mutually agreed by stipulation that January 16,
5 2018, would be Pro-Tect's deadline to file its Reply in support of **ECF No. 28. ECF No. 36.** Due
6 to the holidays, the Parties' schedules and the person(s) from Pro-Tect that counsel requires to
7 respond to the Opposition being committed to CES for the next 7-10 days¹, unforeseen
8 circumstances, and additional matters necessitating the attention of the Parties and their counsel,
9 combined with counsel's duty to provide a complete response to the Opposition, the Parties have
10 mutually agreed in good faith that Pro-Tect shall have additional time for its Reply. Thus, the
11 Parties have mutually agreed that Pro-Tect shall have until on or before **January 30, 2018**, as
12 Pro-Tect's deadline to file its Reply in support of **ECF No. 28.** The Parties agree that this
13 Stipulation is being submitted in good faith, and not for purposes of delay. Further, this
14 Stipulation is made in accordance with Local Rule 7-1 and for good cause.

15 **IT IS SO AGREED AND STIPULATED.**

16 KRAVITZ, SCHNITZER & JOHNSON

DURHAM JONES & PINEGAR

17 By /s/ Adam J. Wax, Esq.

18 Gary E. Schnitzer, Esq
19 NV Bar No.395
20 Adam J. Wax, Esq.
21 NV Bar No. 12126
22 8985 S. Eastern Ave., Suite 200
23 Las Vegas, NV 89123
Attorneys for Plaintiff

By /s/ Michael D. Rawlins, Esq.

Michael D. Rawlins
NV Bar No. 5467
10785 W. Twain Ave., Suite 200
Las Vegas, NV 89135
Attorneys for Defendant

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED:**

25 
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26 DATED: January 9, 2018

27 ¹ Plaintiff Pro-Tect is a security company and one of Pro-Tect's largest contracts is to provide security for the CES
28 show currently ongoing in Las Vegas, Nevada. As such, Pro-Tect's representative(s) are working at CES exclusively
for the next 7-10 days, making them unavailable to assist in the Reply.